DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 169 FL 000 944

By- Edgerton, William B.

Recent Anthologies of Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature: A Review Article.

American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.
Pub Date Mar 68
Note- 21p.
Journal Cit- The Slavic and East European Journal; v12 n1 p59-78 Spring 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.15
Descriptors- *Anthologies, *Comparative Analysis, *Content Analysis, Literary Conventions, Literary Criticism, *Literature, Literature Reviews, *Russian, Translation

Harold Segel's recently-published anthology of eighteenth-century Russian literature in English is compared with the Soviet anthologies of Gukovskij and Kokorev (in Russian), the Polish anthology of Jakubowski (in Russian with Polish notes), and the early nineteenth-century Wiener anthology (in English). All of these works are described in some detail and are compared in terms of competence of translation, selection of authors and works, and quality of notes. (AF)

The Slavic and East European Journal

Volume XII, Number 1

Spring 1968

ED025169

Editor: *J. Thomas Shaw, University of Wisconsin, Madison*

Managing Editors: *Robert W. Simmons, Jr., University of Wisconsin; Valdis J. Zeps, University of Wisconsin*

Associate Editors: *Howard I. Aronson, University of Chicago; Morton Benson, University of Pennsylvania; Wayne Fisher, University High School, University of Chicago; Zbigniew Folejewski, University of British Columbia; Edward Stankiewicz, University of Chicago*

Review Editor: *Victor Terras, University of Wisconsin, Madison*

Editorial Committee: *William B. Edgerton, Victor Erlich, George Gibian, William E. Harkins, Rev. Walter C. Jaskievicz, S.J., Henry Kučera, Claude P. Lemieux, Horace G. Lunt, Vladimir Markov, Oleg A. Maslenikov, Hugh McLean, Felix J. Oinas, Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, J. B. Rudnyćkyj, Anthony Salys, Thomas A. Sebeok, Harold B. Segel, Gleb Struve, Nicholas Vakar, Walter N. Vickery, René Wellek, Thomas G. Winner, Helen Yakobson*

ED025169

FL000 944

The Slavic and East European Journal, a journal devoted to research in language, linguistics, and literature, and to pedagogy, is the official publication of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, AATSEEL of the US, Inc., an affiliate of the Modern Language Association of America and the Canadian Association of Slavists and East European Specialists. The AATSEEL is a constituent member of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations. This publication is the successor to *The AATSEEL Journal* and to *The AATSEEL Bulletin*. This journal is published quarterly in March, June, September, and December by the University of Wisconsin Press. Copyright © 1968 by The Regents of the University of Wisconsin.

For individuals, libraries, and institutions, the annual membership is $10.00 per year. A special rate of $5.00 per year has been set for full-time undergraduate and graduate students for a maximum of three years. (Of these fees, $8.33 of the $10.00, and $4.17 of the $5.00, goes for printing *The Slavic and East European Journal*.) Subscriptions to the *Journal* are not available without AATSEEL membership. Single copies may be purchased for $2.50. Claims for missing numbers will be honored up to *four* months after publication.

Correspondence to the Editor and articles intended for publication should be sent to *Professor J. Thomas Shaw, 720 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706*. Books for review and book reviews should be sent to the Review Editor, *Professor Victor Terras, 720 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706*.

Subscriptions, orders and copy for advertisements, and other business correspondence, including orders for back copies, should be sent to the University of Wisconsin Press, Journals Department, Box 1379, Madison, Wisconsin 53701.

Second-class postage paid at Madison, Wisconsin and additional offices.

Printed by The Heffernan Press, Inc., Worcester, Massachusetts 01605.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY The Regents of the University of Wisconsin TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Recent Anthologies of Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature: A Review Article

William B. Edgerton, Indiana University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The appearance of a two-volume anthology of eighteenth-century Russian literature in English translation, brought out by a commercial publisher, is an event in the development of Russian studies in America that calls for special attention. The purpose of this article is to evaluate this new anthology, prepared by Professor Harold B. Segel of Columbia University, in comparison with the other collections generally available for use in American university courses on Russian literature of the eighteenth century.[1]

Overshadowed by the achievements of the giants of the nineteenth century, Russian literature of the preceding age has everywhere been the stepchild of Russian literary studies, not only abroad but even in its native land. As late as 1933 G. A. Gukovskij, the brilliant young founder of modern eighteenth-century Russian literary scholarship, complained that the literature of the eighteenth century attracted the attention of only "a few odd types, lovers of old, antiquarian items, bibliophiles, or else inveterate bibliographers for whom the very remoteness of this period offered abundant opportunities for the solving of bibliographical puzzles."[2] By the time of his arrest in 1949 and his tragic death on 2 April 1950 at the age of only forty-eight, a victim of the final period of Stalinist terror, Gukovskij had created the school of eighteenth-century specialists whose achievements in subsequent years are perhaps the most solid tribute to his memory. The leading Soviet specialist today on eighteenth-century Russian literature, P. N. Berkov, in his recent survey of eighteenth-century literary scholarship said that Gukovskij, "as an outstanding researcher, a remarkable organizer, and a brilliant teacher and popularizing lecturer, was the central figure in the literary historiography of the eighteenth century."[3] Along with his purely scholarly writing even Gukovskij's anthologies and textbooks were of such quality that they became scholarly contributions, and drew praise from such disparate sources as D. D. Blagoj and Dmitrij Čiževskij.[4]

The arrest and death of Gukovskij immediately made him an "unperson" in official Soviet literary scholarship and took his anthologies of eighteenth-century literature out of circulation.[5] In 1952 this gap was filled by the first edition of a new anthology of more than eight hundred pages edited by Professor A. V. Kokorev (1883–1965) of Moscow University, which has since been reprinted three times.[6] The four editions were printed in a total of 135,000 copies.

Until Kokorev's anthology became easily available abroad as a result of the partial restoration of normal cultural relations with the outside world, only two collections of eighteenth-century Russian literature were readily accessible to students in American universities. One was the two-volume anthology of Russian literature in English translation brought out in 1902–1903 by Leo Wiener, of Harvard University, who was the first professor of Russian literature in the United States. The

FL 000 944

first volume of Wiener's anthology contained more than two hundred pages of translations from thirty-four eighteenth-century Russian authors. Since this work has just been reissued, it is appropriate to discuss it here in some detail and particularly to compare Wiener's translations with those now available in the Segel anthology.[7]

The usefulness of the Wiener collection is seriously limited by two things. The first is the enormous variation in the quality of its translations. Wiener did some of them himself and took others from a wide variety of sources, including Sir John Bowring's *Specimens of the Russian Poets* (2 vols., 1821–1823). The second thing that limits its value is Wiener's tendency to follow the assumption of old-fashioned anthologists that a literary work is like a cake, all the qualities of which can be appreciated in even the thinnest slice. Working on this erroneous assumption, Wiener provides us with slices from one to four pages in thickness of Sumarokov's five-act tragedy *The False Demetrius* (*Dimitrij Samozvanec*); Vasilij Majkov's mock-epic *Elisej*; Catherine the Great's comedy *O Tempora* (*O vremja!*); Xeraskov's *Rossiad*; Knjažnin's tragedy *Vadim of Novgorod* and his comedy *Odd People* (*Čudaki*); Ablesimov's comic opera *The Miller* (*Mel'nik—koldun, obmanščik i svat*); Bogdanovič's *Psyche* (*Dušen'ka*), and Kapnist's comedy *The Pettifogger* (*Jabeda*). He does little better with Fonvizin's comedy *The Minor* (*Nedorosl'*), of which he gives only the first act and leaves the reader to wonder how many more there were and what happened in them. All three extracts are so short that they would be worthless no matter how well they were translated. Consequently, I shall say no more about them.

Wiener makes no mention of several writers of comedies and comic operas, notably Lukin, Popov, Matinskij, and Plavil'ščikov, nor of the prose fiction of Ėmin and Čulkov. His section on the eighteenth century takes no account of Krylov and Karamzin. On the other hand, he includes short extracts from a number of eighteenth-century writers who belong more properly to cultural history than to literature, and whose works are not found in most of the literary anthologies. Among them are Ivan Posoškov; the historian V. N. Tatiščev; Metropolitan Platon (Petr Egorovič Levšin); the memoirists Princess Natal'ja Borisovna Dolgorukova, Adrian Moiseevič Gribovskij, and Mixail Vasil'evič Danilov; the learned Princess Ekaterina Romanovna Daškova; the historian Mixail Mixajlovič Ščerbatov; and the almost forgotten diarist Semen Andreevič Porošin. Wiener also prints selections by several poets who are not usually included in eighteenth-century anthologies, among them Ermil Ivanovič Kostrov, Jurij Aleksandrovič Neledinskij-Meleckij, Mixail Nikitič Murav'ev, and two poets who belong rather more to the nineteenth than the eighteenth century—Gavriil Petrovič Kamenev and Ivan Mixajlovič Dolgorukij. He likewise gives a worthlessly short excerpt from Vladislav Aleksandrovič Ozerov's tragedy *Dmitrij Donskoj*, also from the nineteenth century.

Let us now compare the translations of those complete works which appear in the anthologies of both Wiener and Segel. Each translation of Feofan Prokopovič's funeral sermon on Peter the Great is superior in places to the other, and they both can be useful aids to students in reading the original text, but neither translation quite succeeds in conveying the tone of Feofan's oratorical style. In order to achieve the same effect in English the translator would have to lean heavily on the rhythms, the turns of phrase, and the vocabulary of the King James Version of the Bible, which provides the English-speaking world with its closest equivalents to the Church Slavic element in Russian. In general, Wiener's vocabulary tends to echo more of the tone of the original than Segel's. For example, Feofan's "i kol' razdražili dolgoterpenie tvoe!" is translated by Wiener as "and how long we have tempted Thy long-suffering!" Segel's version is "And how we have exasperated Thine long-suffering!" "Exasperated" is closer than "tempted" to the literal meaning of *razdražili*, but it is

foreign to the tone of the sermon, and the unidiomatic use of "thine" before a consonant provides a modern counterpart to the confusion of the jers in medieval Slavic manuscripts after their disappearance from natural speech. On the other hand, almost every example of a more appropriate word in Wiener can be matched by a more appropriate one in Segel, such as "your womanly flesh" instead of "your sex" for *tvoja ženskaja plot'* and especially Segel's "ranks" for *činy* instead of Wiener's ludicrous (though annotated) "chins." Two sentences from the sermon will serve to illustrate the problems presented by Feofan's rhetoric and the differences between Wiener's and Segel's attempts to solve them:

1. Кого бо мы, и какового, и колнкого лишнлися?
   (*Wiener*) What a great and what a good man we have lost!
   (*Segel*) Whom, what kind of man, how great a man have we lost?
2. Но, о Россне, видя кто и каковый тебе оставил, внждь и какову оставил тебе.
   (*Wiener*) O Russia, seeing what a great man has left you, see also how great he has left you.
   (*Segel*) But, O Russia, seeing who and what manner of man has left you, see also how he has left you.

Except for Segel's hopelessly ambiguous "how" as a translation of *kakovu* in the second passage, his versions are closer to the literal meaning of the original than Wiener's but convey less of Feofan's rhetorical power.

For Kantemir's First Satire, "K umu moemu," it is not hard to choose between Wiener's prose translation and Segel's translation into heroic couplets. However alien Kantemir's syllabic verse may be to our present-day taste, we must assume that his thirteen-syllable riming couplets did produce an esthetic effect on his contemporaries. Wiener provides us with no esthetic equivalent, though he does give us a faithful translation. Segel provides us with heroic couplets as an esthetic equivalent of Kantemir's verse pattern, though at the cost of some accuracy (and without quite consistently achieving five-foot lines—a few are hexameters—or complete rimes).

Wiener and Segel both translate Trediakovskij's "Ode on the Surrender of Danzig." But Segel translates Trediakovskij's first version, written in syllabic verse; Wiener translates Trediakovskij's later version, written in accentual-syllabic verse—and both of them translate the two versions into prose.

Lomonosov's "Ode on the Capture of Xotin" is presented by Wiener in an old prose translation first published by F. R. Grahame. Segel's version is done in stanzas shorn of the rime but preserving the line length of the original. One stanza picked at random (the fourth) will provide a basis for comparison of the two English versions:

(*Wiener*) The love of their country nerves the souls and arms of Russia's sons; eager are all to shed their blood; the raging tumult but inspires them with fresh courage; as the lion, by the fearful glare of his eyes, drives before him whole herds of wolves, their sharp teeth vainly showing; the woods and shores tremble at his roar; with his tail he lashes the sand and dust; with his strength he beats down every opposing force.

(*Segel*) The love of country fortifies
The sons of Russia's arms and spirit.
Each one desires to shed his blood
And from the dreadful sound takes courage.
Like some fierce lion, eyes ablaze,
Drives off in fear a flock of wolves

Which show their sharp fangs' poisonous venom.
Its roar makes tremble woods and shores;
And sand and dust stirs with its tail
Which when all coiled strong blows delivers.

Even though Wiener gives us a prose translation, here as elsewhere he somehow captures more of the poetic spirit of the original than Segel—and in the passage above he avoids the ambiguity of Segel's second line and the jarring effect of Segel's use of "like" as a conjunction in the fifth.

Lomonosov's "Morning Meditations" and "Evening Meditations" are given by Wiener in Bowring's verse translations, published eighty years earlier. Bowring maintained the rime scheme of the original (except for using only masculine rimes), but he added an extra iambic foot to Lomonosov's tetrameters and so changed the content that there was little left of Lomonosov except the general idea. Segel publishes the "Evening Meditation" in a version that foregoes Lomonosov's rime (a-b-a-b-c-c) but resolutely maintains the meter. Thus the two translations oblige the reader to choose between a poetic version that is Bowring rather than Lomonosov, and Segel's version, which is faithful to the meaning but is not poetic. The dilemma can be illustrated with the opening stanza:

(*Wiener*) The day retires, the mists of night are spread
Slowly o'er nature, darkening as they rise:
The gloomy clouds are gathering round our heads,
And twilight's latest glimmering gently dies:
The stars awake in heaven's abyss of blue;
Say, who can count them?—Who can sound it?—Who?

(*Segel*) The day conceals its countenance,
Dark night has covered over fields;
Black shade has climbed the mountains' heights;
The sun's rays have inclined from us;
A star-filled vault has opened up;
No number is there to the stars,
No bottom is there to the vault.

Wiener's translations from Sumarokov's poetry are all in prose and are almost worthless. In contrast, Segel's translations are much more representative, and some of them are very well done. He presents the whole of *Dimitrij Samozvanec* (*Dimitrii the Imposter*) in an excellent verse translation done by Raymond and Richard Fortune. While foregoing the riming couplets, they achieve a genuinely poetic rhythm and tone within the iambic hexameters of the original. Segel's selections also include a verse translation of Sumarokov's fable "Pir u l'va" by Barbara Cohen, which contains some very clever lines along with some that limp; a verse translation by William E. Harkins of Sumarokov's song "Ne grusti, moj svet," which does not follow the original quite as closely as Segel's various prose translations but does convey very well the poetic effect of the Russian; and prose versions of "Dve epistoly," "Xor ko prevratnomu svetu," and "Nastavlenie synu" (also given complete in Wiener).

Xemnicer's fables provide an interesting basis for comparing the two anthologies. Wiener gives only a prose version of "Metafizik" and Sir John Bowring's clever but rather free translation into verse of "Lev, učredivšij sovet" (The Lion's Council of State). Segel presents a full dozen fables done in verse by Barbara Cohen. Here, too,

as in her translation from Sumarokov, her work is very uneven in quality. Her version of "Mužik i korova" is a little masterpiece. Elsewhere, though, rimes like *a thing—pulling, student—instrument,* and *mistake—earthquake,* and occasional lapses in language and rhythm produce such a bad effect that one is almost startled to find them standing in the midst of lines that are a delight. Barbara Cohen obviously has real promise as a translator of at least one genre of verse, the fable; and it will be interesting to see how she develops her gift.

Wiener's section on Deržavin contains six poems that are translated—all but two of them into verse—by six different persons. Among these is a version of Deržavin's ode to God, done by somebody named J. K. Stallybrass and first published in London in 1870, which is so good that one wonders why Segel did not simply take it over from the public domain rather than hammering out his own line-for-line translation. For the sake of comparison here is the fourth stanza:

(*Wiener*) All existence thou containest
In Thee, quick'nest with Thy breath;
End to the beginning chainest;
And Thou givest life through death.
Like[8] as sparks spring from the fire,
Suns are born from Thee, great sire:
As, in cold clear wintry day,
Spangles of the frost shine, sparkling,
Turning, wavering, glittering, darkling,
Shine the stars beneath Thy ray.

(*Segel*) The chain of being dwells within Thee—
'Tis by Thee given breath, sustained.
The end Thou joinest to beginning
And givest life along with death.
As sparks are scattered and surge onward,
'Tis thus that suns are born of Thee;
As on a clear cold wintry day
Small particles of hoarfrost glisten,
'Tis thus in the abyss beneath Thee
The stars, revolving, brightly glint.

Stallybrass' version is old-fashioned, to be sure (so is Deržavin's!), but it is also poetic. And even while maintaining the complete metrical pattern of the original, including the alternation of masculine and feminine rimes, it is also remarkably faithful to Deržavin's meaning.

From what has already been said, it is no doubt clear that the best translations in the eighteenth-century section of Wiener's anthology are those not done by Wiener himself. Indeed, the inescapable conclusion one must draw from a comparison of the verse translations in Wiener and Segel is that there is only one way to produce a readable anthology today of eighteenth-century Russian poetry in English, and that is to go back and collect the best verse translations that were published during the first two thirds of the nineteenth century. Wiener's anthology would provide a good starting point for the compiling of such an anthology, for among the most useful parts of the little introductions he gives to the life and works of each author are his bibliographical notes on English translations.

The second American anthology, and the first one with the texts in Russian, was published in two volumes in 1951 and 1953 by Professor Clarence A. Manning, then

of Columbia University.[9] With the study of Russian expanding rapidly and with few copies of Gukovskij's anthologies available outside of the leading university libraries, Manning's two volumes at least had the virtue of making some 250 pages of Russian texts easily accessible. The work was brought out by the King's Crown Press, established by Columbia University Press to make specialized scholarly material available at minimum cost. In the Manning collection, however, economy was achieved only by sacrificing a good deal of convenience to the reader: the use of photo-offset printing deprived the book of the variety of type faces and sizes that would have made for easier reading, and the table of contents was limited to the bare names of the authors represented. The work contains no index, and so it is impossible to discover what selections the two volumes contain without thumbing all the way through them. The first volume opens with a scant seven pages of introductory material, and short introductions are provided to each author. One of the most serious deficiencies in the work, particularly in view of the fact that it is obviously intended for future scholars, is its complete lack of any bibliographical information whatever (even about the sources from which the texts are drawn). As a result, the student can go through the whole of Manning's anthology without getting even a hint of the textological problems involved in what he has read. Manning offers him the original, syllabic, version of Trediakovskij's "Stixi poxval'nye Rossii" (dating it 1730 without indicating that this is the date of its first publication rather than of its composition), but Manning nowhere reveals that Trediakovskij later rewrote a number of his early poems, including this one, changing the meter from pure syllabic to accentual-syllabic. Manning provides his reader with the full text of Fonvizin's comedy *Nedorosl'*, but he makes no mention of the existence of an early version, which was first published in 1933 in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*. Manning prints a complete text of Radiščev's ode "Vol'nost'," but he does not tell his reader *which* text he chose to print, or even let his reader know that a highly controversial textological problem exists here. In an anthology of English literature for high school students, or even for college undergraduates, such a popularized treatment might be all right; but the only American students who read anthologies of eighteenth-century Russian literature in the original are our future scholars, and any anthology published for them should conform to the scholarly standards they themselves are expected to acquire.

The confining limits of 250 pages naturally prevented Manning from compiling an anthology comparable in usefulness to Kokorev's 800-page Soviet edition. The only complete dramatic works in his whole collection are Fonvizin's *Nedorosl'* and Sumarokov's tragedy *Sinav i Truvor*. The inclusion of this latter work is undoubtedly the most valuable single contribution Manning makes in his anthology, for the full text of *Sinav i Truvor* is not easily available anywhere else. He also gives short excerpts from five other plays, which are partially saved from futility by Manning's brief paragraphs giving the reader some notion of what goes before and after. The same procedure is used with Majkov's *Elisej* and Bogdanovič's *Dušen'ka*, but in both cases Manning presents his fragments without adequately informing his reader about their structural relation to the total works.

Among the prose works, Manning's most useful contributions are Feofan Prokopovič's funeral oration on Peter the Great, which is found in none of the Soviet anthologies of eighteenth-century literature; and the complete text of Catherine the Great's "Skazka o Careviče Xlore," which is important for its relation to Deržavin's famous ode "Felica." (A complete translation of this tale, under the title "Prince Khlor," is found in Wiener's anthology.) Manning also gives a thin slice of Catherine's comedy *O vremja!* and a few excerpts from her journal *Vsjakaja vsjačina*—all of which adds up to little but gives Catherine more space than she normally gets

in Soviet anthologies. It is surprising that Manning failed to include a prose work as important and as short as Karamzin's "Bednaja Liza." Ėmin is represented only by a few unsatisfactory fragments of *Pis'ma Ernesta i Doravry,* and Čulkov only by the complete text of "Gor'kaja učast'."

Apart from Lomonosov and Deržavin, who are reasonably well represented within these space limitations, Manning's treatment of poetry leaves a good deal to be desired. The inclusion of only two short works in addition to his tragedy *Sinav i Truvor* gives a one-sided impression of Sumarokov's position in Russian Classicism; and Manning contributes nothing to a more just appreciation of the unduly scorned Xeraskov by giving thirteen long pages of his interminable epic *Rossijada*—and nothing else.

For all its deficiencies, Manning's anthology can still play a useful supplementary role in American universities because of the works it contains that are not readily available in other editions—Feofan Prokopovič's funeral sermon on Peter the Great, Deržavin's ode to God, Sumarokov's *Sinav i Truvor,* and the selections from Catherine the Great. But even its usefulness as a supplement would be eliminated by the appearance of these works in well-edited Soviet editions.

By the time the third edition of Kokorev's anthology appeared in 1961, importers of Soviet books were able to assure American universities of a steady supply, and this work is now well established as the basic text for most American graduate courses on eighteenth-century Russian literature. Kokorev's introductions to the various authors are skimpy, and his explanatory notes are so inadequate that the selections must bristle with difficulties even for native Russians. Nevertheless, his anthology provides more than enough material for the usual one-semester course in eighteenth-century literature, and it leaves remarkably few gaps that are serious enough to require filling in from other sources. Perhaps the most striking omission is Deržavin's ode to God, which within relatively few years was translated at least eight times into German, ten into Polish, and fifteen into French, as well as into Croatian, Czech, English, Modern Greek, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Lusatian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovenian, Spanish, and Swedish.[10] Another noticeable omission in Kokorev is Catherine the Great, whose comedy *O vremja!* was included at least in abridged form in the anthologies of Gukovskij as well as Wiener and Manning.

Kokorev presents his material chronologically and follows the usual Soviet periodization. The first of his three sections, covering the first thirty years of the century, contains the complete text of "Gistorija o rossijskom matrose Vasilii"; extracts from "Istorija o Aleksandre, rossijskom dvorjanine"; examples of both the prose and verse of Feofan Prokopovič, including his "tragedokomedija" *Vladimir,* his poem addressed to Kantemir, and his well-known "Plačet pastušok v dolgom nenastii," but not his sermon on the death of Peter the Great; a selection of poetry of the Petrine Age, both literary and popular; excerpts from a "school drama," *Slava rossijskaja*; three comic *intermedii*; and a short extract from the first Russian newspaper, *Vedomosti,* founded by Peter.

Kokorev's second section, entitled "Literature of the 1730's to 1750's," is devoted entirely to the works of Kantemir, Trediakovskij, Lomonosov, and Sumarokov. The inclusion of the First, Second, and Seventh Satires provides ample material for acquainting the reader with Kantemir; but here, as elsewhere in his anthology, Kokorev's editorial work leaves much to be desired. Even when he does occasionally provide an explanatory footnote, his explanations are not always correct. For example, in lines 114–115 of Kantemir's First Satire "Vot dlja čego ja, ume, nemee byt' kluši / Sovetuju . . ." Kokorev misses the point of the whole image and interprets *kluša* here to mean *galka* 'jackdaw' instead of the correct *nasedka* 'setting hen'—than

which, as every farmer knows, nothing can be *nemee*. Kokorev then goes on to derive *kluša* in this sense from some Polish word that was evidently unknown to the editors of the H—K volume of the Polish Academy of Sciences' new *Słownik języka polskiego* (Warszawa, 1961).

Even more puzzling, however, is the question why Kokorev allowed his book to go through four editions without correcting a whole series of glaring misprints that distort both the metric pattern and the meaning of Kantemir's Seventh Satire. Each edition carefully reproduced the following errors.[11] Kokorev has an extra comma in line 102, and completely botches line 103: "Put' i beglost', i togo, skol' velika sila, / Put' i beglost', v tvari vsemu znat' istu pričinu," for "Put' i beglost' i togo, skol' velika sila / Nad drugim; v tvari vsemu znat' istu pričinu—." The same sort of accidental repetition occurs again in lines 132–133: "I ostavil by ja s zlym serdcem razum ostryj. / I ostavil by ja vse dobro tomu, kto s čužogo," for ". . . Vveril by ja vse dobro tomu, kto s čužogo." "Dobrodetel' potomu nad vsem neotmenno / Nužno mladencem vnušat'" should be ". . . mladencam . . ." (ll. 125–126). "P'janica byl srodnik, / Koj vskormil" should be ". . . Čto vskormil" (ll. 197–198). And "I vred" (l. 200) should be "I vret." A similar example of careless editing carefully reprinted is to be found in the next to last line of the excerpts from Trediakovskij's *Tilemaxida* (4th ed.; p. 104), where *pokoliku* is changed to *poskol'ku*.

Lomonosov is represented by fifty pages of well-chosen selections. The only addition this reviewer would particularly like to see is Lomonosov's short introduction to his collected works, "O pol'ze knig cerkovnyx v rossijskom jazyke," which would make available in his own words the ideas about style that every student of eighteenth-century Russian literature must get acquainted with in any case. The curious way in which Lomonosov's "Gimn borode" is printed here, as in various other Soviet editions, calls for a special comment. Admittedly, classroom analysis and discussion of the entire poem would present certain problems because of the scabrous nature of its second stanza and the four-line refrain that follows each of its ten stanzas. By printing it in bowdlerized form, however, with the second stanza and the refrain omitted completely, Soviet editors give their readers a seriously distorted version of what Lomonosov actually wrote. Better no "Hymn to the Beard" at all in textbooks than a "Beard" hacked up to fit somebody's notions of classroom puritanism. The classics of eighteenth-century Russian literature also need protection against the "varnishers of reality."

The more than seventy pages of selections from Sumarokov provide ample material for an appreciation of his role in Russian Classicism. His tragedy *Dimitrij Samozvanec* is given in full, his comedy *Opekun* is only slightly abridged, and a few scenes are given from his comedy *Rogonosec po voobraženiju*. Also included are selections from Sumarokov's fables, love songs, epigrams, and prose writings, as well as his "Nastavlenie xotjaščim byti pisateljami," his satire "O blagorodstve," and his controversial "Xor ko prevratnomu svetu."

Almost three fourths of Kokorev's anthology is devoted, understandably, to the literature of the last forty years of the eighteenth century. More than two hundred pages are assigned to drama. Two comedies, Lukin's *Ščepetil'nik* and Fonvizin's *Brigadir*, and two comic operas, Popov's *Anjuta* and Ablesimov's *Mel'nik—koldun, obmanščik i svat*, are printed in complete form. Substantial portions are given of Kapnist's comedy *Jabeda* and Knjažnin's tragedy *Vadim Novgorodskij*; and excerpts —in most cases unsatisfactorily short—are presented from two further comedies, Knjažnin's *Xvastun* and Plavil'ščikov's *Sidelec*; three more comic operas, Matinskij's *Sanktpeterburgskij gostinyj dvor*, Nikolev's *Rozana i Ljubim*, and Knjažnin's *Nesčast'e ot karety*; and Nikolev's tragedy *Sorena i Zamir*.

The two famous Russian mock epics of the eighteenth century, V. I. Majkov's *Elisej* and Bogdanovič's *Dušen'ka,* are represented by excerpts substantial enough to give the student a reasonably good idea of them both. Here too, however, it is unfortunate that a whole series of typographical errors have been reprinted in each new edition of Kokorev—even the fourth, which was not merely printed from the old plates but was reset in type. Here are the ones I have noticed in Majkov's *Elisej*: line 140, for *Už* read *Uže*; l. 190, *Grjaduščaja . . . kazni—Grjaduščija*; l. 277, *Amfalii—Omfalii*; l. 357, *eto—èto*;[12] l. 414, *Podščisja ty . . . pomoč'—Potščisja.* There are some repeated typographical errors also in Bogdanovič's *Dušen'ka*: *Spesivnym* for *Spesivym* (p. 541, l. 11); *Kregtja* for *Krjaxtja* (p. 544, l. 11);[13] *proščalis' s kem izveki* for . . . *naveki* (p. 553, l. 39); *soedinjajuči* for *s''edinjajuči* (p. 559, l. 42).

Except for the entirely unjustifiable omission of "Bog," the work of Deržavin is adequately represented (42 pp.). Nine fables from Xemnicer and several from Fonvizin, Majkov, and Dmitriev help the student to follow the development of this typically eighteenth-century genre from Sumarokov to the later Krylov. Xeraskov's *Rossijada* is amply represented by his own summary of it along with the four-page sample given by Kokorev, but this sample alone gives a distorted view of the range of Xeraskov's activity in poetry.

The prose of the Age of Catherine is less satisfactorily represented in Kokorev than the poetry and drama. The excerpts from Novikov's satirical journals would have gained in value for the student if Novikov's side of his lively controversy with Catherine had been completed with the appropriate passages from her *Vsjakaja vsjačina.* Kokorev's six pages from Emin's *Pis'ma Ernesta i Doravry* are scarcely enough to give the reader an adequate notion of that 800-page novel—and yet one may wonder whether its artistic value is worth more than a six-page sample. Čulkov's lively picaresque novel *Prigožaja povarixa,* on the other hand, is well represented: Kokorev prints intact almost the first two thirds of the only surviving fragment of that work. He gives a little more than one third of Radiščev's *Putešestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu,* but it is impossible to get an adequate impression of the whole work from his selection—which omits, for example, "Toržok," Radiščev's important chapter attacking censorship. For the American student, however, the inadequacy of Kokorev's selections from Radiščev is of minor importance. Since Radiščev's *Journey* is more significant as a social document than as a work of art, and since Leo Wiener's fairly adequate English translation is now in print,[14] most American teachers of eighteenth-century Russian literature would probably rather have their students read the whole of the *Journey* in English translation than read Kokorev's skimpy selections in the original Russian.

Krylov's "Poxval'naja reč' v pamjat' moemu deduške" can appeal to the reader as a work of art even in Kokorev's somewhat abridged version; but the three odd letters from *Počta duxov,* unsupported by any real introductory material in Kokorev's anthology, can give the student no inkling of the real nature of Krylov's satire in that short-lived publication.

Kokorev's selections for the 41 pages that he allots to Karamzin are probably as adequate as any 41 pages could be. Since no anthology could do justice to the five hundred pages of the *Pis'ma russkogo putešestvennika,* Kokorev can scarcely be censured for devoting only ten pages to it. What is open to criticism is not Kokorev's choice of materials but his treatment of them. In contrast to his practice in the rest of the book, where abridged selections are fairly consistently labeled "v sokraščenii" or "otryvki," he gives the reader not the slightest warning that the four most important Karamzin selections—half of the total—contain sizable omissions. The ten pages of letters selected from the *Pis'ma russkogo putešestvennika* contain 26 pages of

omissions—each omission indicated in the text by suspension points (...) which the reader cannot possibly distinguish from Karamzin's frequent use of three periods as a stylistic device. Under the title "Marfa Posadnica, ili pokorenie Novgoroda (Istoričeskaja povest'), Kniga pervaja," Kokorev presents three and a half pages of text in which suspension points are used seven times by Karamzin as a stylistic device, seven times by Kokorev to indicate omissions totaling seven pages—and once by Karamzin and Kokorev together to indicate both things at once! Apart from the cryptic "Kniga pervaja," the reader has no way of finding out from Kokorev that these are mere excerpts from the first of three "books" of a story running to fifty pages in length. Publishing this kind of selection in an anthology is an utter waste of space.

According to the statement on the title page, Kokorev's anthology is authorized for use in universities and pedagogical institutes, and yet some Soviet guardian angel —I can't believe it was Kokorev—has taken it upon himself to protect the tender minds of Soviet university students against the perils lurking in Karamzin's *Bednaja Liza*. On page 787 (4th ed.), just after Liza "threw herself into his arms," three blushing sets of suspension points mark the omission of passages totaling nearly a page.

Karamzin's early poem "Poèzija" is undoubtedly the worst-edited selection in the book. Suspension points ambiguously mark the omission of five passages totaling over 76 lines—but three other passages totaling 23 lines are omitted without giving the reader any hint of the fact. In addition to these sins of omission each edition of the anthology has carefully repeated two typographical errors in the poem, one of which distorts the rhythm and the other distorts the sense. Kokorev's omission of the word *mira* changes the seventh line from a hexameter to a pentameter. On page 802 the meaning of four lines is confused by errors in one letter and one punctuation mark:

Несися на крылах превысренних орлов [Несяся]
Которые певцов божественныя славы
Мчат в вышние миры, да тему почерпнут
Для гимна своего. Певец избранный Клопшток [своего, певец]
Вознесся выше всех...

But then the meaning of the text has already been so greatly distorted by all the deliberate omissions that these typographical errors make little additional difference.

Karamzin's friend Dmitriev fares little better in Kokorev's anthology. His famous satire "Čužoj tolk" is cut down by half, with two lines of dots marking the excisions; and the reader is left to guess at what the original structure of the poem may have been. The editorial treatment of his clever, cynical "Modnaja žena" prompts us to suspect here too the heavy Victorian hand of that same Guardian Angel we caught molesting *Poor Liza*. In this bowdlerized version the story ends abruptly with the departure of the one-eyed old husband on a shopping tour in town and the unexpected entry into his young wife's cosy boudoir of the well known ladies' man Milovzor. The Guardian Angel's three ambiguous dots must make uninformed Soviet students wonder whether this was the best Dmitriev could do—and must make the rest of them wonder why socialist property is wasted on the printing of a poem so mangled that it makes no sense. In my own unenlightened bourgeois way I wonder too.

Aleksandr Vasil'evič Kokorev was nearly seventy years old when the first edition of his anthology appeared in 1952; and he died on 26 October 1965, only a few months after the publication of the fourth edition. Such circumstances as age and health may very well account for some of the defects pointed out here which have been repeated in each successive printing. I have called attention to these defects precisely because I think Kokorev's anthology is so useful that it deserves to be cor-

rected and improved.[15] If some responsible Soviet scholar will undertake the task of preparing a revised and corrected fifth edition, he will perform a useful service not only to teachers and students at home but also to a growing number of his colleagues and their students in other countries.

Apart from unwarranted omissions and outright errors, the principal weaknesses of Kokorev's anthology are its sketchy introductions and its wholly inadequate explanatory notes on the difficulties presented by eighteenth-century Russian. All these have been largely overcome in a remarkable anthology based, in the main, on Kokorev that was published in Poland during the 1950's by Professor Wiktor Jakubowski, the head of the Russian Department at the University of Cracow.[16] His anthology contains three volumes of introductory material in Polish and texts in Russian, totaling 565 pages (which correspond to about 405 pages in the format of Kokorev's book); and three additional volumes, totaling 284 pages, that are devoted to detailed and excellent notes in Polish explaining linguistic difficulties and obscure literary and historical allusions. With less than half as much space available for texts, Jakubowski naturally does not provide nearly so broad a coverage as Kokorev; and yet even within his more limited space he includes a number of significant works that Kokorev passed over, among them Feofan Prokopovič's funeral sermon on Peter the Great, the second as well as the first of Fonvizin's comedies (in not wholly intolerable abridgments), Lomonosov's "Utrennee razmyšlenie" as well as his "Večernee razmyšlenie," Deržavin's "Bog," and the complete text of Dmitriev's "Modnaja žena," thus letting Polish students in on what happened when the one-eyed old husband got back home. The texts are carefully edited, and I recall encountering only five typographical errors not already listed in the printed errata slips: (*Teksty*, II, p. 100, l. 4), omission of "nikaxta efo ne sateret," before "nikaxta z nim ne sasporit," and (*Przypisy*, II, p. 53, n. 154) of the corresponding "nikogda ego ne zaderet," before "nikogda s nim ne zasporit." The word *velika* is omitted in "Kol' sila velika Rossijskogo jazyka!" (*Teksty*, III, p. 7, l. 30); "Kotorye v zavisti sočli" (*Teksty*, III, p. 69, l. 20) should read "Kotory . . ."; and "čtjašča ego svitu" (*Przypisy*, I, p. 25, l. 28) should be "čtjašča svoju svitu."

Concise essays introduce not only each author but also each individual work, and exact bibliographical information is given about the source from which each selection is taken. In these little essays Jakubowski does not limit himself to the usual recital of dates and facts commonly found in anthologies. He may discuss historical material essential to an understanding of the work (e.g., I, 24–25, on Feofan Prokopovič's "Plačet pastušok v dolgom nenastii"); he may deal with the influence of the work on the fate of its author (e.g., II, 138–140, on Knjažnin's *Vadim Novgorodskij*) or on later Russian writers (numerous examples mention Puškin, Gogol', Batjuškov, Baratynskij, Ryleev, Krylov, and others); or he may provide a running commentary showing the relation of one work to another (e.g., *Przypisy*, III, 7–18, on Majkov's *Elisej* as a parody of Petrov's translation of the *Aeneid*). Jakubowski discusses each work not only within its historical setting but also in connection with possible native and foreign influences upon it. He considers Kantemir's satires in relation to both Horace and Boileau (I, 31–32); Deržavin's poetry in relation to an ode of Frederick the Great (III, 50), Young's *Night Thoughts* (III, 51, and *Przypisy*, III, 41), Haller's *Die Ewigkeit* (twelve lines of which are quoted in German in *Przypisy*, III, 40), and Anacreon (who is quoted in the original Greek in III, 98–99); La Fontaine's influence on Xemnicer (III, 115) and Dmitriev (III, 250); Sterne's influence on Radiščev (III, 140); and the relation of *Moll Flanders* to Čulkov's *Prigožaja povarixa* (III, 120). In his three-page discussion of Deržavin's "Pamjatnik" he gives the Latin text of Horace's ode, the Polish text of Ludwik Morstin's translation of it, eight lines of Lomonosov's version, six lines of Kapnist's, and several lines from Puškin's (III,

93–95). For all his attention to the historical, cultural, and social significance of each work he by no means neglects its esthetic significance. Both in his introductory essays and in his voluminous notes he keeps constantly in the foreground those esthetic elements which are the distinguishing marks that set off literature from non-literature. If the Polish (and Ukrainian) influences on early eighteenth-century literature seem to get somewhat less attention than they deserve, still Jakubowski does keep constantly in mind for his Polish readers various points of reference between the Russian works and Poland. His section on Deržavin is particularly strong in this regard, containing numerous references to Polish translations of Deržavin's poetry, several actual quotations from them, and a long commentary by Mickiewicz on Deržavin's ode to God.

Taken together, Jakubowski's introductory essays and his hundreds upon hundreds of explanatory notes form a mosaic-like history of eighteenth-century Russian literature that is remarkably complete. But they are even more than that: by the time the student has gone through all the wealth of material in these essays and notes, he has also learned a certain amount about problems of literary scholarship. For example, he will be acquainted with the Soviet controversies over the authorship of "Xor ko prevratnomu svetu" (I, 101–102), "Otryvok putešestvija v *** I*** T****" (II, 24), and "Pis'ma k Falaleju" (II, 30); he will be familiar with the question raised in 1954 by K. Pigarev about the real authorship of the early version of Fonvizin's *Nedorosl'* (II, 72); he will be aware of the conflicting interpretations of Knjažnin's *Vadim Novgorodskij* (II, 141–142); and he will know something of Soviet controversies over the text of Radiščev's "Vol'nost'" and over the interpretation of Radiščev's political outlook in his *Journey from Petersburg to Moscow* (III, 135–145, 202–203).

In connection with this latter question Jakubowski's essay on Radiščev contains an error that apparently reflects a last-minute change in the size of his selections from Radiščev's *Journey*. In his discussion of the *Journey* Jakubowski takes issue with the Soviet scholar G. P. Makogonenko over his explanation of what appears to them both to be a contradiction between "liberal reformism" in the chapter entitled "Xotilov" and a "call to revolution" in the chapter entitled "Gorodnja"; and in a footnote (III, 144) Jakubowski promises further details in his notes on "Xotilov." But when we turn to the appropriate place in his selections from Radiščev's *Journey* (III, 181), we find that Jakubowski has omitted "Xotilov" entirely!

But this is a minor blemish that can easily be corrected in a second edition. Altogether, his work is a model of careful scholarship and effective pedagogy. This is not to say, of course, that all his interpretations can be accepted without question. In regard to Radiščev, for example, I am not convinced that either Jakubowski or Makogonenko has fully succeeded in explaining Radiščev's attitude toward revolution—although they are both undoubtedly closer to the truth than D. S. Mirsky was in the incredible statement he made about Radiščev's *Journey* in his famous little handbook on Russian literature. "It would seem," said Mirsky, "that he wrote it merely out of literary ambition and that it is no more than a rhetorical exercise on a subject suggested and familiarized by Raynal."[17] One is almost driven to conclude that Mirsky was so offended by the clumsy style of the *Journey* that he refused to believe Radiščev could be sincere.

The first volume of Jakubowski's anthology clearly suffers from the fact that it was printed in 1954. In a bibliographical note on the last page of Volume I he lists three anthologies that range in date of publication from 1812 to 1952—but he says not one word about the five editions of G. A. Gukovskij's *Xrestomatija po russkoj literature XVIII veka* that were published in Kiev and Moscow between 1935 and 1938 or about the anthology Gukovskij published in Leningrad in 1937, all of which were landmarks in the study of eighteenth-century Russian literature. But then we

may question whether Jakubowski was really responsible for this glaring omission: in 1954 the Soviet Union had not yet had its Twentieth Party Congress, Poland had not yet had its own October, and the martyred Gukovskij was still officially classified as an "unperson." Unlike other leading Soviet specialists on the eighteenth century, particularly Berkov, Makogonenko, and Blagoj, whose names appear frequently in Jakubowski's anthology, the name of Gukovskij is apparently mentioned only once, on page 234 of Volume III, which was published in 1959.

Another thing one misses in Jakubowski's essays on the writers of the early part of the century, particularly Trediakovskij and Lomonosov, is any discussion of their relation to the whole Baroque movement in European literature. This subject, in which Poland itself occupies a by no means insignificant place, has long interested scholars in Central and Western Europe and in recent years has attracted the attention of Soviet scholars as well.

All these criticisn s together, however, do not weigh very heavily against all the merits of Jakubowski's book. I share the hopes expressed in a highly favorable Polish review of it that Jakubowski will soon bring out a second, enlarged edition, and that the publisher will make provision for an index and will issue the volumes in a permanent binding.[18] A new edition would make a contribution to Russian studies extending far beyond the borders of Poland. In the United States its usefulness has already become apparent to a few graduate students whose choice of Polish as their second Slavic language has made the book accessible to them; and a new edition might even have a certain influence on the decision our graduate students make when they select their second Slavic language.

Much of the material in Jakubowski's introductions and explanatory notes has been made available to readers of English in the two-volume history and anthology of eighteenth-century Russian literature in English that has just been issued by Professor Segel. The following passages on Xemnicer from Jakubowski's third volume of texts, pp. 113–114, and Segel's second volume, pp. 239–241, will serve as an illustration:

Iwan Chemnicer, urodzony w guberni astrachańskiej, był synem lekarza wojskowego, wychodźcy z Saksonii. Mając lat trzynaście wbrew woli ojca wstąpił do wojska. Po dwunastu latach służby podał się do dymisji i otrzymał skromne stanowisko w zarządzie górnictwa: tłumaczył dzieła z zakresu mineralogii, brał udział w redagowaniu słownika górniczego. Około r. 1770 zaprzyjaźnił się z Mikołajem Lwowem, w tym też czasie zaczyna pisać.

W latach 1776–1777 Chemnicer razem z M. Lwowem podróżował po Niemczech, Francji i Holandii. Zachował się jego dziennik podróży

Generally regarded as the best fable writer before Krylov, Ivan Ivanovich Khemnitser was born in the district of Astrakhan, the son of an army doctor who had emigrated to Russia from his native Saxony. When he was thirteen years old, the young Khemnitser joined the army against his father's wishes. He remained in military service for a period of some twelve years and then put in for retirement, accepting a relatively modest position as a translator of books on mineralogy and as a member of a committee convened to edit a dictionary of mining terms.

His literary career began about 1770, when he became acquainted with Ivan [sic] Aleksandrovich L'vov (1751–1803), an architect, scientific writer, and poet of some talent.

In 1776 Khemnitser and L'vov set out together for over a year's travel through Germany, France, and Holland. Khemnitser's diary of the journey, which has been pre-

świadczący o niezwykle szerokim zasięgu zainteresowań kulturalnych.

W 1782 r. Chemnicer został mianowany konsulem generalnym w Smyrnie, gdzie też zmarł po ciężkiej i długotrwałej chorobie. . . .

Pierwszą próbą literacką Chemnicera była napisana w stylu Łomonosowa bardzo słaba "Ода на победу при Журже" (1770). Nie ukazały się w druku za życia poety satyry wymierzone przeciwko przekupstwu sędziów i urzędników: "На худых судей" i "На худое состояние службы" oraz "Ода на подьячих." Zachowało się kilka jego epigramatów.

Wybitne stanowisko w literaturze rosyjskiej zajął Chemnicer dzięki swym bajkom, których napisał 104. Pierwsze ich wydanie, zawierające 27 utworów, ukazało się anonimowo w r. 1779 pod tytułem "Басни и сказки NN" (bez wskazania roku wydadania). W roku 1782 pojawiło się, również anonimowe, drugie wydanie, uzupełnione 36 nowymi bajkami.

Po śmierci Chemnicera jego przyjaciele Lwow i Kapnist przygotowali do druku trzecie trzytomowe wydanie jego bajek z pięknymi drzeworytami Olenina pod tytułem: "Басни и сказки И. И. Хемницера. В трех частях." С.-Петербург 1799. Wydanie to zawiera liczne poprawki mające na celu bądź złagodzenie ostrości wymowy społeczno-politycznej poszczególnych ustępów, bądź usunięcie idiomatów uważanych przez wydawców za gminne, niektóre bajki zostały nawet całkowicie przeredagowane. Pierwotny tekst autorski został przywrócony dopiero w wydaniu krytycznym dzieł Chemnicera, przygotowanym przez J. Grota, które się ukazało w 1873 r.

Po ukazaniu się wydania 1799 bajki Chemnicera zdobywają popularność, która szybko rośnie i przej-

served, is still interesting reading, particularly in the light of his wide range of cultural interests.

In 1782 Khemnitser was given the position of Russian consul general in Smyrna (the present-day Turkish city of Izmir), where he died two years later after a protracted illness.

Khemnitser's first literary flight was the weak *Ode on the Victory at Giurgiu* (Oda na pobedu pri Zhurzhe, 1770), composed in the style of Lomonosov's panegyrics. This was followed by such pungent satires on corrupt judges and officials as *On Bad Judges* (Na khudykh sudei), *On the Bad Situation of the Service* (Na khudoe sostoianie sluzhby), and the *Ode to Clerks* (Oda na pod'iachikh), which for obvious reasons were not printed in the author's lifetime. Apart from these works and several epigrams, Chemnitser is remembered almost exclusively now for his fables, of which he wrote some 104.

The first edition of Khemnitser's fables included twenty-seven works and was published anonymously in 1779 under the title *The Fables and Tales of N. N.* (Basni i skazki N. N.). A second edition, augmented by thirty-six new fables, appeared, also anonymously, in 1782.

After Khemnitser's death his friends L'vov and Kapnist prepared for publication a third edition of his fables, in three volumes. This bore the title *Fables and Tales of I. I. Khemnitser, in Three Parts* (Baiki i skazki I. I. Khemnitsera. V trekh chastiakh, 1799), and included woodcuts by the artist Olenin.

The L'vov–Kapnist edition of 1794 carried a number of textual emendations; these served two purposes in the main—the blunting of Khemnitser's sometimes bitingly sharp social satire and the elimination of words and phrases the editors considered offensive to good taste. The original versions of Khemnitser were restored only in the critical edition of his works published under the editorship of I. Grot in 1873.

When the first volume of Khemnitser's fables appeared in 1799 it received a quite favorable reception, and soon proved im-

ściowo dorównuje niemal sławie Kryłowa (w 1855 r. ukazało się 36 wydań). Od drugiej połowy XIX w. popularność ta zaczyna się zmniejszać.

. . .

W bajkach Chemnicera występuje tematyka charakterystyczna dla satyry rosyjskiej XVIII w.: walka z samowolą i korupcją aparatu administracyjnego i sądowego, pychą szlachecką, wyzyskiem słabszych przez możnych itp.

Pod względem formalnym cechują je—w odróżnieniu od suchej zwięzłości bajek-przypowieści Sumarokowa —obfitość szczegółów obyczajowych i przewaga dialogu nad narracją. Oryginalną właściwością bajek Chemnicera jest brak tradycyjnego dla tego gatunku literackiego morału końcowego: wysnucie wniosku moralnego pozostawione jest czytelnikowi.

Styl Chemnicera odznacza się prostotą i lekkością. Wprowadzając potoczne, a nawet gminne zwroty idiomatyczne, starannie unika wulgarności właściwej Sumarokowowi.

Bajki Chemnicera pisane są tradycyjnym dla tego gatunku zmiennomiarowym wierszem jambicznym.

mensely popular. This popularity so increased with time that Khemnitser's reputation as a fable writer seriously rivaled that of Krylov. In fact, it was only after the middle of the nineteenth century that Khemnitser's popularity began to decline.

The subject matter of Khemnitser's fables differs little from that of the eighteenth-century Russian satire; however, in comparison with Sumarokov's fables they are much richer in social details, and reveal the author's greater preference for dialogue than for narration. In a significant departure from previous Russian fable writing, Khemnitser also usually avoids the concluding moral, which was virtually a convention of the genre. His style is light and simple and his language colloquial, although he is rarely guilty of the vulgarity we meet often in the fables of Sumarokov.

As with Sumarokov, and later Krylov, Khemnitser uses iambic lines of varying length.

Other materials from Jakubowski that are made available to readers of English by Segel can be found on the following pages (unless otherwise noted, the Roman numerals after Jakubowski's name refer to the volumes of texts rather than notes):

Segel, I, 84–85 (Jakubowski, III, 137–138); 85 (Jakubowski, II, 135–137); 86–88 (Jakubowski, II, 138–141); 97 (Jakubowski, III, 25); 119 (Jakubowski, I, 9–10); 165 (Jakubowski, I, 49); 193 (Jakubowski, I, 66–67); 202 (Jakubowski, I, 73–74); 209–210 (Jakubowski, I, 77); 242–243 (Jakubowski, I, 101–102); 255–256 (Jakubowski, II, 6–8); 352–357 (Jakubowski, III, 139–145); 393, 395 (Jakubowski, III, 224–225).

Segel, II, 76, 78 (Jakubowski, III, 233–234); 108 (Jakubowski, III, 37); 123–127 (Jakubowski, III, 6–9); 128–143, footnotes (Jakubowski, *Przypisy,* III, 5–17); 180–182 (Jakubowski, III, 24–26); 183–184, footnotes (Jakubowski, *Przypisy,* III, 18–19); 254–257 (Jakubowski, III, 49–51); 264 (Jakubowski, III, 55); 267 (Jakubowski, III, 64–65); 271–279, footnotes, (Jakubowski, *Przypisy,* III, 27–35); 280 (Jakubowski, III, 71); 281 (Jakubowski, *Przypisy,* III, 40); 305, 307 (Jakubowski, *Przypisy,* III, 49–50); 308 (Jakubowski, III, 95); 318, 320 (Jakubowski, II, 50–52); 395–396 (Jakubowski, I, 88–89).

Lest there be any misunderstanding I hasten to emphasize that Segel's introductions are in no sense mere translations. In practically every case the material drawn

from Jakubowski is worked into longer essays that also reflect Segel's own years of experience in dealing with the eighteenth century.

In contrast to the other anthologies discussed here, Segel's is not organized along wholly chronological lines. He makes the usual three-part periodization of the century, fixing his boundaries according to political events: "Part 1: The Age of Peter the Great (1689–1725)"; "Part 2: Peter's Successors to the Ascension of Catherine II (1725–1762)"; and "Part 3: The Reigns of Catherine II (1762–1796) and Paul I (1796–1801)." The first two of these periods are organized by authors, and the third is organized by genres. There is a real question whether this arrangement will solve as many problems as it creates. Sumarokov, for example, is listed in Part II along with Kantemir, Trediakovskij, and Lomonosov; but at least three, and possibly four, of the five works by Sumarokov presented in Part II were actually written during the period covered in Part III, the reign of Catherine. Indeed, near the end of Segel's second volume, which is devoted entirely to the Age of Catherine, the reader comes upon Sumarokov again under the heading of "The Drama: Tragedy," which is represented by his *Dimitrii the Imposter*. This arrangement of the material by genres leads to a similar splintering of other writers in the Age of Catherine. Under "The Literature of Travel," a subdivision of the larger section on nonfictional prose in the Age of Catherine which Segel places at the end of his first volume, we find Fonvizin, with a selection of letters from his two journeys abroad; Radiščev, with excerpts from his *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow*; and Karamzin, with a few pages from his *Letters of a Russian Traveler*. Then Fonvizin turns up again in Volume II under "The Drama: Comedy," with *The Brigadier*; Karamzin reappears with seven literary essays under another subdivision of nonfictional prose and again in Volume II, with "Poor Liza" and "The Island of Bornholm," under prose fiction; and Radiščev returns at the end of Volume II with his poem "The Eighteenth Century"—which is not placed, however, in the section on lyric poetry (represented here only by Deržavin), but is given a position by itself in a special section entitled "The End of an Age" and listed as Part 4 of the whole anthology. This classification by genres even at the expense of splitting up the work of individual authors reflects both the problem confronting all literary historians and Segel's way of solving it. Obviously the student of literary history needs to see both the development of genres and the development of individual writers. Concentrating attention upon one at the expense of the other is like closing one eye when we look at a landscape: we avoid the problem of bringing both eyes into focus, but we also forego the advantage of perspective. The real question for the teacher of literary history is whether to attempt both approaches simultaneously, or whether to choose one for his basic organizing principle and then encourage his students to make the other approach for themselves, perhaps in preparation for their final examination.

In contrast to all the other anthologists discussed here, Segel sets for himself the modern and highly commendable principle of consistently presenting works in their entirety, making an exception in his Preface only for Radiščev's *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow* and Karamzin's *Letters of a Russian Traveler* on the grounds that "respectable English translations already exist" (I, 18). (Unfortunately, this statement is open to serious question in the case of Florence Jonas' translation of the *Letters of a Russian Traveler* [New York, 1957], which was strongly criticized for her abridgment of Karamzin's text.) In actual fact Segel's exceptions to his own principle are not limited to Radiščev and Karamzin: he not only makes his own selections from Fonvizin's letters from abroad, omitting many that are highly interesting, but also makes his own excisions (duly noted, I should add) in seven of the eleven letters he does print. Two other unmentioned—though perfectly understand-

able and justifiable—exceptions to his own rule are Ėmin's *Letters of Ernest and Doravra,* which is represented here by a translation of Kokorev's brief selections; and Xeraskov's *Rossiad,* of which Segel gives an excerpt from Canto I that is only slightly longer than the one in Kokorev. On the other hand, Segel's complete English versions of such works as Čulkov's novel *Prigožaja ṗovarixa,* Majkov's *Elisej,* and Bogdanovič's *Dušen'ka,* not to mention numerous shorter pieces, will prove to be a welcome and useful contribution to the resources available to American graduate students for the study of eighteenth-century Russian literature.

Inevitably the question will arise about what audience Segel's anthology can be expected to reach and just how it will probably be used. Obviously, its appeal will be restricted largely to the universities, and within the universities largely to graduate students in Russian and perhaps a few others in comparative literature. Can it be used as the basic textbook for graduate courses in eighteenth-century Russian literature? In my opinion it cannot. The reason for this lies both in the nature of the literature of that period and the nature of Segel's translations. Apart from most of its comedies and most of the production of Novikov, Radiščev, and Karamzin, the works of the greatest significance in eighteenth-century Russian literature were written in verse. Moreover, Russian literary developments in that century were so closely bound up with metrical problems and with the creation of the Russian literary language that no translations, however faithful, can serve in university courses as a satisfactory substitute for the original texts.

In addition to the general problem confronting all translations of Russian verse literature from the eighteenth century, Segel's translations raise once more the long-debated question about how much a translation should convey of the original form of poetry. One answer might be given in terms of an analogy: translations of verse that are limited to conveying the "content" can be compared to black-and-white reproductions of paintings. The person who is insensitive to rime and rhythm in his own language would miss nothing in such translations, just as the completely color-blind person would sense no loss in black-and-white reproductions of Monet. For those who are not so handicapped, the loss is enormous. With the exception of a very few poems translated mainly by others, the poetry in Segel's anthology is turned either into English prose (Feofan Prokopovič, Trediakovskij's "Solemn Ode on the Surrender of the City of Danzig," Lomonosov's "Letter on the Use of Glass," Sumarokov's "Two Epistles" and "Instruction to a Son," Majkov's *Elisej* and Bogdanovič's *Dušen'ka*) or into line-for-line versions that sometimes preserve the meter of the original, sometimes preserve the same number of syllables in each line without the meter, and sometimes do neither. The adequacy of this procedure can perhaps be best suggested with a few specific examples. As I have already mentioned, the rimed couplets in syllabic verse of thirteen syllables that Kantemir used for his First Satire have been transformed by Segel into fairly regular heroic couplets—the only example in his anthology, I believe, of an effort to preserve the rime of the original in his own translations. (No attempt is made anywhere in this book to reproduce syllabic verse in English.) Trediakovskij's "Song on the Coronation of the Empress Anna," which is written in syllabic verse in six-line stanzas with a rime scheme of a-a-b-c-c-b and a syllabic length of 11-9-13-9-9-7, has been translated by Segel into a simple line-for-line prose version that fairly accurately conveys the literal meaning of the words but nothing else. The translations of Lomonosov and Deržavin sometimes preserve the meter of the original but never the rime scheme. The translation of the fragment from Xeraskov's *Rossiad* consistently preserves the thirteen-syllable line of the original, but the translator has only rarely succeeded in his announced attempt to preserve its six-foot iambic meter. The result of all this is that the

reader who has gone through all the selections in both volumes of Segel's anthology still has no first-hand impression of the nature of eighteenth-century Russian poetry.

If Segel's anthology cannot serve as the basic textbook for courses in eighteenth-century Russian literature, it can still serve a highly useful purpose in three ways as an auxiliary tool. In the first place, his introductory article of nearly a hundred pages and his bibliography offer the student a convenient means of orienting himself in the subject. In the second place, his translations of certain prose writers such as Ėmin and Čulkov, and of prose works like Fonvizin's letters and Karamzin's essays, may well be given a basic place in eighteenth-century courses so as to make more time available for reading works of greater significance in the original Russian. Finally, Segel's anthology can serve above all as a legitimate "pony" for the serious student who will use it properly as a means of achieving a more complete understanding of the Russian originals.

What we really need even more than Segel's anthology is a huge volume of explanatory notes to accompany Kokorev's anthology which would be comparable in thoroughness to the three volumes of Jakubowski's *Przypisy*. But no American publisher, even a university press, would even consider such a quixotic undertaking. Consequently, even though Segel's anthology will not take the place of detailed Jakubowskian notes explaining all the difficulties lurking in the eight hundred pages of Kokorev, it will still go far toward disentangling the syntax of Kantemir's First Satire, interpreting the colorful language of *Elisej*, and in general narrowing the gap of understanding between eighteenth-century Russian and the Russian that is spoken today.

As in any book of this scope, it is not surprising that a few misprints and other minor errors should have slipped past the proofreaders of Segel's anthology. For the sake of future editions I will note the following: (I, 35) "to administer their spiritual needs" ("to minister to . . ."); (I, 39) "Although written in the traditional Polish-derived syllabic system of versification, Prokopovich introduced . . ."; (I, 71) "From 1789–1794"; (I, 84) "had recourse to an expediency"; (I, 87) "It was not to be reprinted, and then with certain 'inflammatory' lines omitted, until 1871" (better: "It was not to be reprinted until 1871, and even then only with certain . . ."); (I, 90) "woven into the texture of the writing that filled out the shells of the newly introduced forms of European classicism"; (I, 97) "free verse" is used here in the sense of the Russian *vol'nye stixi*, which is not the same thing at all; (I, 105) the date of Xeraskov's *Plamena* is not 1786, since it was already in print in 1765; (I, 114) "Venevetinov" (for "Venevitinov"); (I, 173) "But if the voice of my lyre would equal" (for "should equal" or "equaled"); (I, 183); "They fall headlong, soulless" (*bez duši* here means "unconscious"); (I, 258) "Not undaunted, Novikov issued a new journal" ("Undaunted . . ."); (II, 247) "alright"; (II, 283) "[Thou] Who filleth all with Thine own Person, Embraceth, moldeth, and preserveth" (for "fillest . . . Embracest, moldest, and preservest"); (II, 317) "All that remained of [Deržavin's] *On Mortality* was the fragment beginning 'Time's River in Its Ceaseless Coursing. . . .'" Nearly ten years ago Morris Halle demonstrated that this last poem from Deržavin's hand not only is not a fragment but actually is an acrostic, spelling out "RUINA ČTI."[19]

Presumably Professor Segel will also take advantage of the opportunity in the next edition to correct the most serious error in his entire anthology: his failure to include any mention of Wiktor Jakubowski's *Antologia literatury rosyjskiej XVIII wieku* either in his eight-page bibliography of works in six languages, or among his acknowledgments in the Preface, or anywhere else.

NOTES

1 *The Literature of Eighteenth-Century Russia,* ed. and tr., and with an Intr. and Notes, by Harold B. Segel, 2 vols. (N.Y.: E. P. Dutton, 1967). 472, 448 pp. ($2.95 ea., Paperback).

2 Г. Гуковский, "За изучение восемнадцатого века," «Литературное наследство,» IX/X (1933), 294.

3 П. Н. Берков, «Введение в изучение истории русской литературы XVIII века, часть 1: Очерк литературной историографии XVIII века» (Л., 1964), 216.

4 Д. Д. Благой, «История русской литературы XVIII века» (М., 1945), 16; D. Čiževskyj, (review) "G. A. Gukovskij, Russkaja literatura XVIII veka, M., 1939," *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie,* XVII (1941), 469–474. Berkov in the book mentioned above, p. 209, wrote as follows about Gukovskij's textbooks: "В связи со своей преподавательской деятельностью Г. А. Гуковский подготовил «Хрестоматию по русской литературе XVIII века,» выдержавшую в 1935–1938 гг. 5 изданий (3—в Москве, 2—в Киеве). Им же была издана большая антология «Русская литература XVIII века» (Л., 1937) с обширной вступительной статьей и примечаниями, часть которых имеет исследовательский характер. Наконец, был напечатан учебник Гуковского для высших учебных заведений «Русская литература XVIII века» (М., 1939), в значительно большей степени самостоятельный научный труд, чем учебник в обычном понимании этого слова."

5 Gukovskij's arrest also led to the disappearance of every reference to him in the second edition of Blagoj's history of eighteenth-century Russian literature. A detailed comparison of Blagoj's first edition (1945) with his revision of 1951 has been published by Gleb Struve in "Russian Eighteenth-Century Literature Through Party-Colored Spectacles," *SEEJ,* XV (1957), 22–33. Gukovskij remained unmentioned in the third edition (1955), but his name finally reappeared in the fourth (1960). Professor Wiktor Jakubowski (see note 16, below) has edited an excellent Polish version of this work (Dymitr Błagoj, *Historia literatury rosyjskiej XVIII wieku* [Warszawa, 1955]), which contains a number of features that make it more useful than the Russian original, notably Jakubowski's index of persons and works, his citation of foreign titles in the original language as well as in translation, and his additional annotation of items less familiar to the foreign reader than Blagoj evidently assumed them to be for Russians, not to mention the convenience of the running heads supplied at the top of every page. Unfortunately, the Polish version is translated from Blagoj's politically bowdlerized second edition of 1951 rather than the superior first edition of 1945.

6 А. В. Кокорев, сост., «Хрестоматия по русской литературе XVIII века» (М., 1952; 2-е изд., 1956; 3-е изд., 1961; 4-е изд., 1965).

7 Leo Wiener, *Anthology of Russian Literature from the Earliest Period to the Present Time,* 2 vols. (N.Y., 1902–1903). Reprinted by Benjamin Blom, N.Y., 1966; 2 vols., 980 pp. $25.00 [sic].

8 A misprint in Wiener's text gives this line the meaningless reading: "Life as sparks spring from the fire." The correct form here is taken from Wiener's source, "Russian Ode to the Deity," tr. J. K. Stallybrass, *Leisure Hour,* 2 May 1870, pp. 316–317.

9 Clarence A. Manning, *Anthology of Eighteenth Century Russian Literature,* 2 vols. (N.Y., 1951–1953).

10 В. А. Францев, «Державин у славян: Из истории русско-славянских литературных

взаимоотношений в XIX ст.» (Прага, 1924), 80 стр.; and Jakubowski (see Note 16, below), III, 71.

11 The correct forms are cited from: Антиох Кантемир, «Собрание стихотворений» (Библ. поэта; Л., 1956), 157–172.

12 The editor of В. И. Майков, «Избранные произведения» (Библ. поэта; М., Л., 1966), who prints the literary form *èto*, and Kokorev, who prints the dialect form *eto*, both base their text of *Elisej* on the same separate edition of 1771. One of them has to be wrong.

13 If this irregular spelling is really found in the edition (not accessible to me at the moment) upon which Kokorev based his text of *Dušen'ka*, then Kokorev's failure to standardize it violates his own spelling principles as enunciated in his Preface.

14 Thaler's well-annotated edition of Wiener's translation (Aleksandr Nikolaevich Radishchev, *A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow*, tr. Leo Wiener, ed. with an Intr. and Notes by Roderick Page Thaler [Cambridge, Mass., 1966], 286 pp.) is a welcome contribution to English-language sources for the study of eighteenth-century Russia; but even after Thaler's revision the translation is not free of misinterpretations and ambiguities. In "Krestsy" (p. 108), for example, Radiščev's phrase *synok tvoj, znatnyj bojarin* 'your son, a high-born nobleman' is translated as "your son, a famous man." An even more serious mistake occurs at the end of "Mednoe," when the narrator meets "a foreigner, a friend of mine," on the staircase and says to him, in the Wiener–Thaler translation: ". . . You once cursed the barbarous custom of selling black slaves in the distant colonies of your country. . . ." Their misleading choice of "colonies" rather than "settlements" or "plantations" as a translation of *selenija* completely obscures the fact that Radiščev obviously refers here to an American. Indeed, one prominent Soviet specialist on the eighteenth century has privately conjectured—though not, I believe, in print—that the prototype of the American in "Mednoe" may very well have been Francis Dana, who served as a diplomatic representative of the United States in Petersburg from 1781 to 1783.

15 Further examples of Kokorev's careless editing and inconsistent textological principles, especially in his selections from Feofan Prokopovič, are pointed out in a review by Jacob Hursky [Jakov Gurskij] in *Novyj žurnal*, No. 85 (1966), 293–296. Professor Hursky calls particular attention to the way in which Kokorev's anthology, especially in its later editions, misrepresents the Ukrainian element in Russia literature of the early eighteenth century.

16 Wiktor Jakubowski, ed., *Antologia literatury rosyjskiej XVIII wieku*, 6 vols. (Warszawa, 1954–1959), Część pierwsza, 1700–1760: Teksty, 113 pp., Przypisy, 76 pp. (1954); Część druga, 1760–1800: Teksty, 194 pp., Przypisy, 100 pp. (1957); Część trzecia, 1760–1800: Teksty, 258 pp., Przypisy, 108 pp. (1959).

17 D. S. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature*, ed. and abridged by Francis J. Whitfield (N.Y., 1949), 58. In the relatively short period between his return to Russia from England in 1932 and his arrest in 1935, Mirsky expressed considerably more interest in Radiščev. In his article on eighteenth-century Russian literature in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, IX/X, 507, he wrote: "Литература буржуазно-демократической оппозиции представляет для нас первостепенный интерес, а в ней прежде всего Радищев, изучение которого удивительно мало подвинулось вперед со времени революции."

18 Review by Tadeusz Kołakowski, *Slavia Orientalis*, IX (1960), 193–199.

19 Morris Halle, "О незамеченном акростихе Державина," *IJSLP*, I/II (1959), 232–236.